

R E M A R K S

Several claims (1, 5, 8 and 16) have been canceled, to expedite prosecution but without prejudice to the scope of protection to which applicant is believed entitled. Claim 2 has been amended to clarify its recital of certain novel and distinguishing features of the invention, and claim 3 has been amended in response to the Examiner's objection. In addition, in view of the cancellation of claims 1 and 5, claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 12 have been made independent. Since this Amendment increases the number of independent claims by four (beyond the number previously paid for), a check in payment of the requisite additional fee of \$800 is submitted herewith.

Claims 2 - 4, 6, 7 and 9 - 15 are in the application. No claim has been allowed, but claims 6, 7, 9 and 11 - 15 have been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to incorporate all recitals of the base claim and any intervening claims on which they heretofore depended.

Claim Objections

In response to the objection to claims 3 and 4, the term -thermosensitive - has been inserted before "adhesive" in line 3 of claim 3, on which claim 4 is dependent. It is believed that this amendment fully and self-evidently overcomes the stated objection to both claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With reference to the rejection of claims 2 - 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Jones et al. in view of Adams et al., it may initially be noted that claim 2 (now independent,

incorporating all recitals of claim 1) has been amended herein to specify that the timing mark is located at a point which is both apart from the side edge of the first label sheet (20, Fig. 3C) and apart from the line (L", Fig. 3C) along which the first label sheet is cut or semi-cut to produce a second label sheet (200, Fig. 3D). Then added recitals, supported by the disclosure of the original application in Figs. 3C and 3D and the description in the specification relating thereto, clarify the difference between the timing mark position in the present invention and that in the background art illustrated in applicants' Figs. 2C and 2D.

In particular, by forming a timing mark at the point defined in amended claim 2, a problem in that a label adhered to a good peels from the portion bearing the timing mark, which is not adhered to the good, can be avoided.

Neither Jones et al. nor Adams et al discloses this feature of positioning of the timing mark as defined in amended claim 2. In Jones et al. (Fig. 6), the timing marks (registration marks 108) are not spaced apart from the side edge of the first label sheet. In Adams et al. (Figs. 3A and 3B), similarly, there is no spacing between the timing marks (registration marks 16) from a side edge of the first label sheet. Whether considered separately or together, the two references do not provide any suggestion or motivation for modifying their uniform teachings that the timing marks are located at points on (not apart from) a side edge of the first label sheet. Hence, applicants' claimed solution to the aforementioned problem would not be obvious from the applied references, however combined.

It follows that amended claim 2, and claims 3 and 4 dependent thereon, distinguish patentably over Jones et al., Adams et al., and any proper combination thereof, by virtue of the defining recitals of timing mark location at a point apart from both the

side edge of the first label sheet and the line of cutting to produce a second label sheet.

Turning to the rejection of claim 10 (now independent, incorporating all recitals of claim 1) under §103(a) as unpatentable over Jones et al. in view of Adams et al. and further in view of Ichikawa et al., applicants submit that, contrary to the Examiner's assertion at p. 7 of the Office Action, Ichikawa et al. does not disclose any silicone-modified thermoplastic resin. In particular, none of the compounds and compositions mentioned by Ichikawa et al. at col. 9, line 51 - col. 10, line 33 (cited by the Examiner) is or includes any silicone-modified thermoplastic resin. Therefore, Ichikawa et al. does not supply what is lacking in Jones et al. and Adams et al. with respect to the recital, in claim 10, that "the thermosensitive adhesive layer comprises a silicone-modified thermoplastic resin." This being so, applicants further submit that the latter recital distinguishes claim 10 patentably over Jones et al., Adams et al., Ichikawa et al., and any proper combination thereof.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6 and 7 have been rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base claim (1) and the intervening claim (5) on which they were heretofore dependent. Claims 9, 11 and 12 have been rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base claim (1) on which they were heretofore directly dependent. Thereby, the objection to these claims as being dependent on a rejected base claim is overcome. The rewriting of claims 11 and 12 in independent form also overcomes the same objection as to claims 13 - 15, because claim 13 is dependent on claim 12 and claims 14 and 15 are both directly or indirectly dependent on claim 11.

All of claims 6, 7, 9 and 11 - 15 have been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form as has been done herein.

For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is accordingly courteously requested.

Respectfully,

Christopher C. Dunham
Christopher C. Dunham
Reg. No. 22,031
Attorney for Applicants
Tel. (212) 278-0400

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Christopher C. Dunham
Christopher C. Dunham, Reg. No. 22,031
Date: JULY 19, 2005